



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,223	09/15/2003	Masakazu Koizumi	10873.1301US01	2121
52835	7590	07/27/2005	EXAMINER	
HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER & LARSON, P.C. P.O. BOX 2902-0902 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			NGUYEN, CHAU N	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2831	

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/663,223	KOIZUMI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chau N. Nguyen	2831	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-6 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-6 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Michiya (6,296,493).

Michiya discloses a pressure welding type anisotropic conductive elastic connector (Figures 5A and 5B) comprising plural beryllium copper wires arranged linearly and regularly in the thickness direction of a silicone rubber, the pressure welding type anisotropic conductive elastic connector being produced by the process comprising the steps of: arranging the beryllium copper wires on a thin unvulcanized silicone rubber sheet in parallel to and close contact with each other, the beryllium copper wires being insulation-coated, curing the thin unvulcanized silicone rubber sheet in this state so as to form a cured rubber sheet: further adhering a thin unvulcanized silicone rubber sheet on the beryllium copper wires arranged on the cured rubber sheet to provide an adhered sheet: laminating a

plurality of the adhered sheets so as to form a block form, heating and vulcanizing the block-formed laminate in this state so as to form a cured sheet, and slicing the sheet, wherein an electric insulation coating is formed to a thickness of $1\mu\text{m}$ or more on side faces of the beryllium copper wires and the beryllium copper wires are arranged in close contact with each other in the direction of the arrangement (col. 8, line 55 through col. 9, line 9). Michiya also discloses the beryllium copper wires being coated with nickel and gold respectively (col. 8, lines 55-56).

Michiya does not specifically disclose end faces of the beryllium copper wires being plated with nickel and gold respectively. However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to also provide the end faces of the Michiya beryllium copper wires with nickel and gold as Michiya did for the length of the wires to further protect the end faces of the wires from being corrosive. Note that the electric insulation coating in Michiya would have a withstand voltage of $1\text{V}/\mu\text{m}$ or more since it comprises structure and material as claimed.

The modified connector of Michiya also discloses the ends of the wires being exposed from the silicone rubber and having a length that is substantially the same as the thickness of the insulation elastic resin material. Regarding the limitations of "fixing a thin unvulcanized rubber sheet of the preform sheet to a reel drum of a reel device", "the wires being reel up at a constant pitch onto the

preform sheet on the face of the drum", "removing the preform sheet from the reel drum and opening the preform sheet", and "electroless plating", it has been held that during examination, the patentability of a product-by-process claim is determined by the novelty and nonobviouness of the claimed product itself without consideration of the process for making it which is recited in the claim. In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964.

3. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Michiya in view of Doi (6,103,359).

Claim 6 additionally recites the arrangement density of the linear conductors being different depending on a predetermined conducting current capacity. Doi discloses an anisotropic conductive connector in which the arrangement density of the linear conductors being different depending on a predetermined conducting current capacity (Figs 1-3, 6 and 7). It would have been obvious that depending on the specific use of the resulting connector, one skilled in the art would arrange the linear conductors of Michiya in different densities to meet the predetermined conducting current capacity as taught by Doi.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed April 7, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because the patentability of a product-by-process claim is determined by the novelty and nonobviouness of the claimed product itself without consideration of the process for making it which is recited in the claim. In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau N. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-1980. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dean Reichard can be reached on 571-272-2800 ext 31. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Chau N Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2831